

S/N 10/727,240

Response to Office Action Dated 02/09/2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

APR 09 2007

A review of the claims indicates that:

- A) Claim 18 remains in original form.
- B) Claims 1—17, 19—28 and 32—34 are previously presented.
- C) Claims 29—31 are withdrawn.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims and withdrawal of the rejections.

§103 Rejections

The independent claims 1, 14, 21, 25, 32 and 33 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gebert (US 2002/0111963) in view of PODI (a web-based document). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions for generating a PDF (portable document format) document from a PPML (personalized print markup language) document, the processor-executable instructions comprising instructions for:

- parsing structures within the PPML document;
- generating a PDF document tree;
- interpreting the parsed structures from the PPML document onto locations on the PDF document tree; and
- configuring a PDF document according to the PDF document tree.

The PODI document fails to teach or suggest PPML to PDF translation.

Instead, PODI teaches that a PPML document can be reconfigured so that its assets are in PDF format. For example, a PPML document having JPEG and other assets would become a PPML document having PDF assets. However, the

S/N 10/727,240

Response to Office Action Dated 02/09/2007

1 document would still remain a PPML document. Thus, PODI does not teach or
2 suggest PPML to PDF translation.

3 The PODI document teaches a product called "Argon PPML/PDF" (see
4 logo in the upper left corner, all slides). Accordingly, PODI teaches the creation
5 of a PPML/PDF document. Such a document is a PPML document wherein all of
6 the assets have been converted to PDF (see slides 25—27 particularly). Thus,
7 assets, such as images in other formats, are all translated to PDF, for inclusion
8 within the PPML/PDF document.

9 Referring to PODI at "1" in slide 26, we see that PPML having exclusive
10 use of PDF is such that "data representation in PPML is limited to integral PDF
11 files." Thus, what PODI teaches is a PPML document having PDF assets within
12 its tree structure. Accordingly, PODI does not teach or suggest translating from
13 PPML to PDF. PODI teaches translating a PPML document having many
14 different asset types into a PPML document having PDF assets. Accordingly,
15 PODI is deficient to support the Section 103 rejection. The Applicant respectfully
16 requests that Claim 1 be allowed to issue.

17 The Gebert reference fails to disclose PPML to PDF translation. Instead,
18 Gebert discloses a printing system that receives an XML source document as input
19 and creates a plurality of page objects that are rasterized and printed (see FIG . 1
20 and other locations). Additionally, XML to PDF translation is disclosed (see
21 [0007] lines 5—9). However, nothing in Gerbert teaches or suggests PPML to
22 PDF translation. In fact, the Patent Office agrees that Gebert does not teach
23 PPML to PDF translation (see Office Action mailed 02/09/2007, at the bottom of
24 page 3).

S/N 10/727,240

Response to Office Action Dated 02/09/2007

Even when combined, Gebert and PODI fail to teach or suggest the elements of PPML to PDF translation. Gebert teaches XML to PDF translation, while PODI teaches translating a PPML document having assets of different types into a PPML document having only PDF assets. Therefore, even when combined the references of record fail to teach or suggest the elements recited by Claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection be removed, and the claims allowed to issue.

XML to PDF translation does not teach or suggest PPML to PDF translation. The Patent Office suggests that XML to PDF translation is equivalent to PPML to PDF translation (see page 3, OA mailed 02/09/07). The implication is apparently that XML to PDF translation suggests PPML to PDF translation. In particular, the Patent Office suggests that, "thus, generating a PDF document from an PPML document is interpreted as requiring the same functionalities as generating a PDF from XML." (See Office Action at page 5, first full paragraph.) The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In fact, PPML is a language adapted for use with variables and XML is not so adapted. Thus, the Office's suggestion that a PPML to PDF translation would require "the same functionalities as generating a PDF from XML" is logically suspect. That is, two different languages, PPML and XML, could be expected to require two different translators to result in PDF. In particular, nothing in XML's makeup suggests PPML's variable handling ability.

In fact, use of PPML teaches away from contemporaneous use of PDF. PPML teaches the use of variables, and therefore a constantly changing output.

S/N 10/727,240

Response to Office Action Dated 02/09/2007

For example, the name and address of a letter could be a variable, and the body of the letter could remain the same. Thousands of letters, each with a different name and address, could be printed using PPML. In contrast, PDF is frequently used because the author of a document can effectively "lock" the document so that it cannot be changed, at least without resorting to tools to which many people do not have ready access. Thus, translation from PPML to PDF is not suggested by the prior art, which does not reconcile this fact.

The Applicant submits that there is no reference of record that teaches or suggests PPML translation to PDF. The prior art of record teaches only that XML can be translated to PDF. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the Office should either find a reference—teaching PPML to PDF translation—or should supply such an affidavit indicating that it is obvious that the translation is suggested by the XML to PDF translation shown in the prior art. In the absence of such an affidavit or new art showing PPML to PDF translation, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection be removed, and the claims allowed to issue.

Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claims 14, 21, 25, 32 and 33

Claims 14, 21, 25, 32 and 33 recite PPML to PDF translation generally, and specifically recite generation of a PDF document tree. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable.

Traversal of Rejection of Dependent Claims

Claims 2—13, 15—20, 22—24, 26—31 and 34 depend from Claims 1, 14, 21, 25, 32 and 33. These claims are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited

APR 09 2007 14:13 FR LEE HAYES

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

P.18/18

S/N 10/727,240

Response to Office Action Dated 02/09/2007
APR 09 2007

1 features that, in combination with those recited in the associated independent
2 claim, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or
3 in combination with one another.

4 **Conclusion**

5 The Applicant submits that the claims as presented are in condition for
6 allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of
7 Allowability be issued. If the Patent Office's next anticipated action is not the
8 issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the
9 undersigned attorney be contacted to schedule an interview.

10 Respectfully Submitted,

11
12 Dated: 09 April 2007

13 By:


David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

14
15 LEE & HAYES PLLC
16 Suite 500
17 421 W. Riverside Avenue
18 Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979